

Lewis County Planning Commission **Public Meeting**

Lewis County Courthouse
Commissioners' Hearing Room – 2nd Floor
351 NW North St – Chehalis, WA

September 10, 2013 - Meeting Notes

Planning Commissioners Present: Mike Mahoney, Russ Prior, Jim Lowery, Arny Davis, Richard Tausch, Clint Brown

Planning Commissioners Absent: Bob Guenther

Staff Present: Stan May, Pat Anderson, Rod Lakey

Others Present: Please see sign in sheet

Handouts/Materials Used:

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes from July 9, 2013
- Public Works Six Year Transportation Improvement Program
- PowerPoint on Shoreline Master Program

1. Call to Order

Vice Chair Brown called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. The Commissioners introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Agenda

There were no changes to the agenda.

3. Approval of Meeting Notes from July 9, 2013

There were no additions or corrections to the meeting notes. Commissioner Mahoney moved to approve; Commissioner Lowery seconded. The motion carried.

4. Old Business

There was no old business.

5. New Business

A. Transportation Improvement Program Update – Rod Lakey, Public Works

Mr. Lakey stated the purpose of the update was to answer questions or take comments from the Planning Commission which would be taken to the Board of County Commissioners. He referred to the handout and briefly described the approved projects. He stated Public Works is targeting grant-funded projects rather than just county-only funded projects in order to maximize Public Works' dollars. Grant money is becoming more scarce but there is still some available to fund projects for the next few years.

Mr. Lakey stated a question from the Planning Commission in the past was what projects were being done to contribute to improve transportation for economic development. There are several projects

within the Port areas and some directly related to industry. Those projects are #9 Bishop Road, which is 100% funded; #16 Rush Road; #19 Harrison Avenue; #21 Avery Road West; #23 Mickelsen Parkway; #27 Gallagher Road Extension; #28 Downie Road Extension; #32 SR 505 Corridor Improvements, which ties in with Mickelsen Parkway for development in the Winlock-Toledo area.

In addition to these projects, Lewis County has applied for .09 distress funds to begin design for a corridor from the north county interchange to the Trans Alta development. This will provide a direct truck access route. The project would help support the north county interchange effort as well as to get trucks away from the bottleneck at Harrison Avenue.

Mr. Lakey asked the Commissioners to look over the TIP and come back with comments or suggestions as to what they would like to see in the future. Projects can be added for anticipated funding or look for funding sources with that input. Construction projects for 2014 and 2015 are funded and the permitting cycle has begun.

Commissioner Lowery asked about Harrison Avenue. He asked if this improvement would go all the way to the Thurston County line. Mr. Lakey stated improvements would be in the Lewis County section to the county line. Commissioner Lowery asked who has the bridge at the county line. Mr. Lakey stated it belongs to Lewis County.

Commissioner Mahoney asked for the status on the project to Blakeslee Junction. Mr. Lakey stated that project is in phase two – Mellen St. to Blakeslee Junction. Construction will take at least two years and Airport Road will be closed for two years. The new Mellen St. interchange will be constructed which is the critical portion. Most of this work will be night work.

Commissioner Brown asked if #5 Federal Forest Road improvement is for specific roads or projects or if it is for general issues for the roads. Mr. Lakey stated it is a placeholder in case a grant opportunity should arise.

Commissioner Prior spoke to #5 Davis Creek Bridge. He understood that the bridge would not be replaced but turnarounds would be on either side of the creek. He asked why money was being spent on the intersections at Highway 12. Mr. Lakey stated the intersection at the east end is a 45 degree coming to US 12. A T intersection will be built so people who are on the east side of Davis Creek do not have to go through an unmaintained section to get their vehicle at a 90 degree to see both sections. Since the bridge is not being replaced they cannot go the other way when they are going to the west. On the west end it is not a true 90 degree intersection so that will be corrected to improve visibility.

Commissioner Prior asked the status of the temporary bridge. Mr. Lakey stated FEMA approved an alternate project which was broken into four projects. The turnarounds and intersection is one of those projects and the temporary bridge is part of the alternate project for not replacing the bridge. This would be a county emergency structure to buy in advance of potential flooding or disaster. It's still with FEMA and the bridge has not been purchased yet, however the process is moving forward.

Chairman Davis asked for elaboration on the .09 funding for the north intersection. Mr. Lakey stated Public Works applied to Lewis County Economic Development Council for funding to make the

connection to Hwy 507 and IPAT to provide an industrial truck route, either using Reynolds Avenue, or Zenkner Valley to avoid school issues.

Chairman Davis asked for the time frame for funding and construction on the Leudinghaus Bridge. Mr. Lakey stated it is slated for 2014 construction. There is no guarantee on that but design is moving along. FEMA takes care of the federal environmental portion and Lewis County the local permit, which it is working on. It is a top priority and it will be advertised in January 2014.

Commissioner Lowery asked if we are still waiting for Centralia on the sidewalks on Borst Avenue. Mr. Lakey stated when grants are applied for they do not rate well to only do half the sidewalk for a safe route to schools or sidewalk funding. Centralia is a key player. If you accept federal funds the project needs to be completed within ten years. He does not know if Centralia is ready to commit to that yet. Also, the total project cost is about \$1.5 million and most grants are for up to \$200,000.

There were no more questions; the Commissioners thanked Mr. Lakey for his presentation.

B. Shoreline Master Program Update – Stan May

Mr. May reported that the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) is moving along; he will have monthly status reports for the Planning Commission. There is no work yet for the Planning Commission. That is being done by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC will make a recommendation and have a product for the Planning Commission next year. Mr. May wants the Planning Commission to see everything that the CAC is seeing and know where to find that information.

Mr. May presented an abbreviated PowerPoint (which can be found on the website) to give a general idea of what the CAC is doing.

Commissioner Prior asked Mr. May to explain what 'jurisdiction' means in this context. Mr. May stated it is not a municipality but rather the part of the county that is covered by shoreline regulations. The shoreline jurisdiction is everything within 200 feet of the ordinary high water mark, or the flood way. The jurisdiction identifies the area that will be regulated by the SMP.

Mr. May stated the first step before a draft SMP is to hold community visioning workshops. There are two scheduled: in Chehalis on September 25 at the Veterans Memorial Museum and in Randle at the White Pass School on October 1. Both start at 6:00 p.m.

The Shoreline Inventory and Characterization (SIC) has just been completed and is waiting for some clarifications from DOE. It is considered the backbone of the SMP and analyzes data, shoreline functions, shoreline use and public access. It describes existing conditions and development patterns and establishes the baseline for "no net loss."

"No net loss" means any development that takes place within the shoreline jurisdiction results in no net loss in the functions and values of the shoreline as it is today. If development occurs on a shoreline it may be required to mitigate in order to prevent a loss of functions and values of that shoreline. Restoration is not required but restoration opportunities will be looked for and that restoration would make the functions better than what they are today.

Commissioner Mahoney asked who decides what makes the functions better. Mr. May stated a restoration project would need to be supported with research and science provided by experts. Restoration is to improve the functions, not take it to pristine conditions.

Commissioner Mahoney was concerned about the language because it is very subjective. It will require a lot more discussion.

Commissioner Brown stated he does not want to see the shorelines damaged, but when the government says you can or cannot do something on your property and you have to pay someone to do a study that may or may not be accepted inhibits the personal freedoms that we enjoy and promote.

Discussion followed. Chairman Davis stated there will be time to address the issues. He asked that Mr. May continue with his presentation.

Commissioner Lowery asked if there is an SMP in place currently. Mr. May stated there is. Commissioner Lowery asked if "updating" it means changing it. Mr. May stated it would need to be changed. Commissioner Lowery asked if "no net loss" is new. Mr. May stated the concept is there; it is a new phrase.

Commissioner Prior stated he had asked that question at the CAC meeting and he understands there is an SMP in place; the new one does add the no net loss and restoration component, and the shoreline jurisdiction has changed because of river meanders, etc. Those are fundamentally the two new things that will need to be dealt with.

Commissioner Brown asked if the no net loss language is required and by whom. Mr. May stated it is required by state law. Commissioner Brown asked for a copy of that language.

Mr. May continued with the PowerPoint. The purpose of the SIC includes the basis for environment designations (zoning), the development of policies and regulations, and identifies opportunities for the protection of ecological resources, improving public access and supporting water dependent uses. It also identifies opportunities for restoration.

Commissioner Mahoney asked if there have been any areas identified that will require restoration from anything other than flood damage. Mr. May stated he does not know of any specific areas.

Mr. May explained the reaches and showed maps of management areas and how the function assessment was achieved. There are 16 management areas in Lewis County.

The SIC is essentially complete. It will be shared at the public visioning workshops. The visioning workshops will be used to collect specific detailed public input on shoreline conditions, use issues and opportunities. The consultant could not identify every opportunity for public access, nor could they identify every opportunity for restoration. Those types of issues are what need to be shared by the public at the workshops.

Commissioner Brown asked what the Planning Commission is being asked to do with regard to the Shoreline Master Program. Mr. May stated the CAC will get a proposed document to the Planning

Commission to review and to add input. The Planning Commission will hold public hearings for public input on the final product and make a recommendation to the BOCC. Each of the jurisdictions in the coalition will hold their own public hearings.

Mr. May encouraged each of the Planning Commissioners to attend one of the visioning workshops to offer his own input and talk to the experts who will be present.

After the visioning workshops the CAC will be looking at environmental designations. Those will be brought to the Planning Commission, also. Mr. May will summarize the visioning workshops at one of the meetings in October.

Mr. May explained how to find all of the information about the SMP – data, maps, SIC, etc. It can be found at <http://lewiscountywa.gov/communitydevelopment/shoreline-master-program>. There will be a link to the EZ view site.

Commissioner Brown asked if the SMP will be based on the new FEMA maps. Mr. May stated it would. Commissioner Brown asked if there would be more properties covered in the new SMP than are now covered. Mr. May stated that was correct. Commissioner Brown stated that it will be very important to communicate to the public exactly what is going on. There was discussion about the flood damage prevention and a lot of misinformation and he hoped that could be eliminated during this update process.

Mr. May encouraged the Planning Commissioners to emphasize that the SMP and regulations that come from it apply only to new development. Nothing currently on the ground has to be changed to meet this program. Mr. May stated it is hoped to have the new SMP adopted by mid-2014.

6. Calendar

The next meeting will be on October 8, 2013. There will not be a meeting on September 24.

7. Good of the Order

No one wished to speak.

8. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.